

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,043	02/14/2002	Gregory M. Chrysler	2207/12666 7585	
23838	7590 03/08/2004		EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON 1500 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			LAVILLA, MICHAEL E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1775	*
			DATE MAILED: 03/08/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/074,043	CHRYSLER ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael La Villa	1775	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a).	of extension and the corresponding amon the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The apploriginally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		i
(a) They raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		to issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>18-29</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) applied	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen			
10. Other:			
TO.[Cev	Why:	m/0 y
		•	<i>'</i>

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

LaMle 2/27/04

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's response does not address the section 112, first paragraph rejection, and so the rejection is maintained. With respect to the section 112, second paragraph rejections, applicant traverses. Applicant suggests that alternative meanings of "thickness just enough to cover a roughness" are not reasonable because they would imply surface peaks all of the same height and because layer 5 of Figure 3 depicts what is claimed. Nevertheless, the claim could be drafted to describe the situation of layer 5, obviating the indefiniteness. A covering layer, meeting the claim language but disavowed by applicant's argument, could be one that follows the topography of the underlying surface and thereby has a nonuniform upper surface topography of its own. For this reason there is indefiniteness, and so the rejection is necessary. Applicant suggests that "predetermined" means "being in a range to allow attachment" and provides effective numerical values. At the bottom of page 4, applicant may be suggesting an amendment to overcome this rejection over the term "predetermined." The suggested phraseology would appear to obviate the rejection by eliminating the indefinite "predetermined" term. There is no reason, in reading the claim as currectly pending, to limit the claim in the manner argued. Hence, the rejections are maintained.

2